



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

SOME PURPOSE CLAUSES: Xen. *Anab.* I. 6. 6; Verg. *Aen.* II. 667

Xen. *Anab.* i. 6. 6, Παρεκάλεσα ὑμᾶς, ἄνδρες φίλοι, ὅπως σὺν ὑμῖν βουλευόμενος ὃ τι δίκαιόν ἐστι καὶ πρὸς θεῶν καὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων τοῦτο πράξω περὶ Ὀρόντα τουτονί.

In this sentence, spoken by Cyrus to his highest Persian officials and the Greek general Clearchus, at the court-martial of Orontas, we find πράξω, the verb of a purpose clause, standing in the subjunctive mood, though the main verb, παρεκάλεσα, is in the aorist tense. The ordinary explanation is that the optative in certain kinds of clauses depending upon secondary tenses may be replaced by the subjunctive, as though they were original subjunctives standing in indirect discourse, unchanged, in dependence upon secondary tenses (Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, §§ 318 ff.). Another current explanation is that the aorist παρεκάλεσα is a logical perfect, and therefore, like the perfect, governs the subjunctive mood.

But the real idea expressed here in the use of the subjunctive is that the purpose of the past act of summoning is still future with regard to the time of speaking; the optative would make the purpose future merely with regard to the act of summoning. Clearness therefore demands the subjunctive; and this comes out in the use of *may* rather than *might* in the English equivalent: "I summoned you, gentlemen, that deliberating with you as to what is right in the sight of gods and of men, I *may* do this in the case of Orontas here."

There are, of course, many instances where the usual explanation of the subjunctive as kept on the principle of the unchanged mood in indirect discourse is the only possible one, as in Xen. *Anab.* i. 4. 18: . . . πλοίοις, ἃ τότε Ἀβροκόμας προῖόν κατέκαυσεν, ἵνα μὴ Κῦρος διαβῇ. But there are other subjunctives which, like that in Xen. *Anab.* i. 6. 6, should be explained as expressing purpose still future with regard to the time of speaking, though they depend upon verbs expressing past time. For example, *Iliad* i. 158, spoken by Achilles to Agamemnon in the course of their quarrel:

ἀλλὰ σοί, ὦ μέγ' ἀναιδές, ἅμ' ἐσπόμεθ', ὅφρα σὺ χαλῆρης,

"But we followed thee, thou utterly shameless man, that thou mayest take pleasure." A similar instance is in *Iliad* vi. 357 f., where Helen says to Hector, of herself and Paris:

οἷσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον, ὥς καὶ ὀπίσσω
ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ' δολίδοι ἐσσομένοισιν,

"On whom Zeus laid an evil destiny, that we may be subject for song hereafter as well, to future generations." Compare also *Iliad* ix. 99 (and ii. 206); *Odyssey* iii. 15; vi. 173; xi. 94; xvi. 234.

The effect of the same combination of ideas—a purpose still future, with a statement in past time—is seen in Verg. *Aen.* ii. 664-67:

Hoc erat, alma parens, quod me per tela, per ignis
eripis, ut mediis hostem in penetralibus utque
Ascanium patremque meum iuxtaque Creusam
alterum in alterius mactatos sanguine cernam?

With these words Aeneas apostrophizes his mother, the goddess Venus, when he finds his father Anchises unwilling to take to flight from their home, though all Troy is in the hands of the Greeks. The sentence structure is not so clear as it might be: *hoc* is subject, with the clause *ut . . . cernam* in apposition; *hoc erat quod* means "was this the reason why . . .," like the familiar *non est quod . . .*, "there is no reason why . . .," and *quid est quod . . .*, "what is the reason why . . ."; *eripis* is a historical present. The relation of the time of *cernam*, as still future, to the time of *erat* and *eripis*, which are both past, is brought out rather more clearly by a paraphrase than by a literal translation; such a paraphrase would run: "Did you save me from the midst of weapons and flames, that I may see the enemy amongst our shrines and Ascanius and my father and Creusa slaughtered in one another's blood?" The literal translation is: "Was this the reason, gentle mother, that thou *didst* bring me in safety through the weapons and the flames, that I *may* see the enemy."

The converse of this relation of ideas appears in Verg. *Aen.* vi. 533-34:

An quae te fortuna fatigat,
ut tristis sine sole domos, loca turbida, adires?

Deiphobus addresses this inquiry to Aeneas, seeking to learn why the latter has come to Hades while still living. The action of *fatigat* is of course present, but is not limited to the present; it began in the past and will presumably continue into the future. Now, as Aeneas has already come to Hades, a present subjunctive, instead of the imperfect *adires*, would be out of place. The action of *adires*, which stands in a substantive clause derived from the volitive, is future with respect to *fatigat* in its past meaning; we may translate: "Or what destiny *plagues* thee, that thou *wast to come* to the sad and sunless homes, the land of confusion?"

The verb of a purpose clause and of clauses of volitive meaning is usually future in respect to the time of the verb on which it depends. But not infrequently it is future also with respect to the time of speaking, though the main verb is past; and occasionally it may be past with respect to the time of the main verb. The two phenomena are illustrated by the English sentences following:

I bought this book yesterday, that I may have it for my use tomorrow.

That I might visit Rome last summer, I am now doing extra work and earning extra money.

These are the principles which have caused the irregularities in mood and tense sequence in the sentences just discussed; and they are factors which in such connections deserve greater consideration than they usually receive.

ROLAND G. KENT